

229

379.713

THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL CANDIDATES.

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH,

AND

DR. SANGSTER.

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & CO., PRINTERS, 86 & 88 KING STREET WEST.

< 1874.

lectur.

Names of Central Committee appointed to secure the Election of Professor Goldwin Smith.

A. BLACK London.
J. B. BROWN Point Edward.
PATRICK BOYLE Brantford.
W. J. CARSON London.
JOHN DEARNESS Strathroy.
JAMES DEVLIN Maidstone.
H. IZARD Woodstock.
D. JOHNSTON Cobourg.
MISS KEOWN Toronto.
D. A. MAXWELL Chatham.
JOHN MONROE Ottawa.
H. MORTON Brampton.

A. F. McDONALD Toronto.
P. McLEAN Milton.
R. McQUEEN Kirkwall.
J. W. McLEAN Dundas.
E. J. MUNGOVAN St. Mary's.
H. MUELLER Berlin.
WILLIAM RANNIE Queensville.
JESSE RYERSON Waterford.
MISS ROUND Toronto.
H. S. SCOTT Davisville.
MISS WHITCOMBE Stratford.
WM. WILKINSON, M.A. Brantford.

SAMUEL McALLISTER, Toronto, *Chairman.*

HENRY BROWNE, Yorkville, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

INTRODUCTION.

A meeting of Public School Teachers, favourable to the return of Professor Goldwin Smith as their representative in the Council of Public Instruction, was held in the Mechanics' Institute, Toronto, on Saturday, July 18th, the day after the Delegates' Convention.

The foregoing Central Committee was appointed by the meeting to promote by every legitimate means the election of Mr. Smith. It at once proceeded to business, and amongst other things passed the following resolution:—

“That this meeting considers it desirable that printed Circulars be issued giving such information as may be deemed necessary by the Committee to secure the election of Professor Goldwin Smith.”

In accordance with this, the present pamphlet has been prepared. The duty to be performed was too important a one, and the dignity of the Profession too much concerned, to permit anything but matters relevant to the issue before the teachers, or anything approaching the scurrilous style of the opposing Candidate to be introduced. In speaking of that Candidate, no attempt has been made either to extenuate anything, or to set down aught in malice.

Publ

FELLOW
leges yet o
Council of P
of the Cand
you should
Sangster, to
owing to th
capacity. I
revelations
it is to be fe
such a candi
of too chival
be said, it is
less might h
he entertain
ploy part of
had his life-

Goldwin
whence he pr
of Lord Selb
Ministry. H
which was in
competition—
training more
Commission i
as Assistant C
remember wit
Association, a
in preparing
our own in ch
ciated, that a
the duties of
Modern Histor
until 1866, wh
History in Co

TO THE

Public and Separate School Teachers OF ONTARIO.

FELLOW TEACHERS,—As in a few days we shall exercise one of the most important privileges yet conferred upon us as a body—that of electing a gentleman to represent us at the Council of Public Instruction—we, a committee appointed by the Delegates who supported one of the Candidates at the Convention held in Toronto on the 17th July, deem it necessary that you should have sufficient knowledge of the two candidates, Professor Goldwin Smith and Dr. Sangster, to guide you in casting an intelligent vote, and we think this especially necessary, owing to the means adopted by the last-named candidate to bring himself before you in that capacity. Mr. Smith accepted the nomination while absent in England, and ignorant of the revelations that were being made about Dr. Sangster and his past doings. Had he known these, it is to be feared his self-respect would not have permitted him to enter the field as the rival to such a candidate, but seeing he had allowed his name to be used by his supporters, he is a man of too chivalrous and honourable a character not to go through with the contest. And here let it be said, it is not to satisfy any ambition that he seeks to be our representative, for that doubtless might have been gratified ere this, but it is purely from the desire which, as a fellow-citizen, he entertains, that, as the representative of such an important body as ourselves, he might employ part of his extensive leisure usefully, in furthering the interests of education, which have had his life-long devotion, and in advancing those of the teachers of the country.

A FEW FACTS CONCERNING MR. SMITH.

Goldwin Smith is the son of an English physician; he received his early training at Eton, whence he proceeded to Oxford, where his career was unusually brilliant, equalled only by that of Lord Selborne (Sir Roundell Palmer), Lord Chancellor of England under the Gladstone Ministry. He was called to the bar of Lincoln's Inn. Was Secretary to the Oxford Commission which was instrumental in opening the rich endowments of that ancient University to public competition—the first great step to popularize University education in England, and to make its training more extensive and thorough. In 1858 he became a member of the Popular Education Commission in England, which sent out Mr. Fraser, now the energetic Bishop of Manchester, as Assistant Commissioner to examine the Educational Systems of America. Many teachers still remember with pleasure the speech of this gentleman at one of the Conventions of the Teachers' Association, and the favourable impression he created. That commission did valuable service in preparing the public mind in England for a plan of Public School Education approaching our own in character. So highly were Mr. Smith's abilities and singleness of purpose appreciated, that a Government to which he was a consistent opponent, not only entrusted him with the duties of a Commissioner, but, about the same time, offered him the Professorship of Modern History at Oxford, which he accepted. The duties of this chair he continued to fulfil until 1866, when he resigned. He was subsequently elected to the chair of Constitutional History in Cornell University, and still spends a few weeks every year in lecturing there.

without fee or reward, beyond the satisfaction of giving a helping hand to a seat of learning that is trying the unique and laudable experiment of making mental culture go hand in hand with industrial training.

His residence is, and has been for some years past, near Toronto. He now regards himself as a Canadian, and takes a lively interest in the affairs of the country, as his articles in the *Canadian Monthly*, on Current Events, &c., show. When in England, during the past winter, he availed himself of every occasion to place his adopted country and her people fairly before the English public. He removed misconceptions, and exerted himself in other ways to promote her interests. He is not a man of limited sympathies, nor of narrow ideas. He is as much at home in nominating a candidate for the Toronto City Council, as in supporting the claims of an aspirant to a seat in the British Parliament. He is a profound scholar, and as an author his writings are characterized by great extent and accuracy of information, and the lofty and refined sentiments of an upright Christian gentleman. His chief works are, "Lectures on the Study of History," "Irish History and the Irish Character," "Three English Statesmen, Pym, Cromwell, and Pitt," in addition to which he has been a frequent contributor to the periodical press, on almost every subject that engages public attention; his original and active mind often bringing him to the front as a leader of public opinion. He is independent in forming his opinions, and fearless in expressing them—whatever he thinks right for the good of the community he boldly pursues. His influence is so general that it is felt even in the councils of our country. He has an extensive knowledge of the School Systems of both England and America. Above all, *he is a man of unblemished character*. He is quite free from any pledges—he has no attachment to the Educational Department to clog his action or cloud his judgment, he has no axes to grind, no bosom friends to serve, and no enmities to gratify. Enough has been stated to show what a valuable man Professor Goldwin Smith would be as our representative in the Council of Public Instruction. The attitude he has taken in this contest as exhibited by the following letters shows how safely he can be relied on to represent us faithfully, and is of itself enough to ensure his return:—

"TORONTO, July 17, 1874.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your kind note, I believe I have only to say that being now again present among you, I cordially ratify my acceptance of the nomination tendered and accepted during my absence; that, if elected, I will do my best to justify your choice, but that I shall esteem it an honour to have been thus nominated, whatever the result of the election may be.

"When you selected me, you no doubt knew as much of my history as it concerned you to know and were aware that I was one of the Commissioners appointed by the Crown in 1858 to enquire into the condition of popular education in England with a view to legislation. We were engaged for three years in the enquiry, which extended to the systems of education in other countries, including Canada.

"As a delegate of the Oxford University Press, I was a member of the committee especially charged with the organization and publication of a series of educational books.

"I have taken no steps to promote my own election. I felt that to do so would be unbecoming, and that a body of electors so competent to judge for themselves, as the teachers of the Province, would regard anything in the shape of solicitation or pressure as an insult.

"Something, I believe, has been said about the moral tone of the lectures delivered by me as Professor of Modern History at Oxford. I have sent a copy of such as are published to Mr. McCausland, who will, no doubt, be at the meeting to-day. I trust that neither in their teaching, nor in my public or private conduct, will anything be found which can bring a stain on the honour of a profession to which I myself belong, though the branch with which I am connected is different from yours, and which I have always regarded, as a whole, with the keenest interest and sympathy.

"I am, Dear Sir,

"Yours faithfully,

"GOLDWIN SMITH.

"Samuel McAllister, Esq., Toronto."

"TORONTO, July 20th, 1874.

"DEAR SIR,—In the journals of this morning there is a report of a meeting of teachers organized to promote my election to the Council of Public Instruction, with reference to which I think it necessary to explain my position to you and my other friends.

"At the meeting it seems to have been proposed to issue, in my interest, and with my sanction, if it could be obtained, a pamphlet or circular setting forth, if I rightly understand what was said, objections of a personal character to the candidature of my opponent.

"In t
probably
that the
the ordi
honour o
duty no
place his
"The
before I
beyond t
troversy
"Wh
and whil
qualificat
should fe
questions
the incli

"Sam

The

"DEAR
lend your
nor the ir
"After
proposal
it necessa
"It is
vailed the

"Profe

The
but has b
he afterw
Central S
on the de
retained
largely us

As e
and unbe
persistent
them. A
tion and
letters wi
about him

If Dr
he is not
he was ou
the chang
of educati
tion. Its
and have
interest in
push on th
tion even
Normal So
he wishes

"In the invitation addressed to me when I was in England, though it was stated that there would probably be other nominations, no name was mentioned, nor was there anything to lead me to suppose that the contest, if there was one, would assume a personal complexion, or turn upon anything except the ordinary qualifications of candidates. I accepted the invitation because I was sensible of the honour done me, and because I hold, as a general principle, that under the election system it is a man's duty not to draw back when called upon; but if he feels capable in any way of serving the public, to place himself at the disposal of his fellow-citizens.

"The circumstances which have imparted so painful a character to the present contest occurred before I had settled in this country; I am not personally cognizant of them; and it would be entirely beyond the line of my duty, as well as at variance with my inclinations, to take any part in the controversy to which they have given rise.

"While, therefore, I again most heartily and gratefully ratify my acceptance of your nomination, and while I desire as a candidate to be loyal to my friends, I must beg you to understand that my own qualifications, such as they are, form the sole ground on which I can appeal to the electors, and that I should feel it necessary to decline to lend my name or sanction to any pamphlet or circular relating to questions with regard to which, whatever may be my private conviction, I have neither the right nor the inclination publicly to express any opinion.

"Yours very truly,

"GOLDWIN SMITH.

"Samuel McAllister, Esq."

The following reply was sent to this letter :

"TORONTO, 21st July, 1874.

"DEAR SIR,—In your letter addressed to me, and published in this morning's papers, you decline to lend your name or sanction to any pamphlet or circular relating to questions you have neither the right nor the inclination to express an opinion upon.

"After conferring with Mr. Browne, the Secretary of the Committee, I am safe to state that no proposal to get your sanction, much less your co-operation, to any pamphlet or circular that we thought it necessary to issue on behalf of our candidate, was ever entertained at the meeting.

"It is true a suggestion of the kind was made, but it was at once dropped, as a general desire prevailed that the Committee should take the sole charge and responsibility of issuing any such pamphlet.

"Yours respectfully,

"SAMUEL McALLISTER,

"Chairman.

"Professor Goldwin Smith, M.A., Toronto."

THE ANTECEDENTS OF DR. SANGSTER.

The other candidate for our suffrage is Dr. Sangster. He is a native of London, England, but has been amongst us in Canada since his childhood. He was trained at the Normal School; he afterwards taught in the Model School for several years, then took charge of the Hamilton Central School, from which he was promoted to be assistant-master in the Normal School; and on the death of Mr. Robertson, he became head-master of that Institution, a position which he retained till 1871. While in the Normal School, he wrote a number of text-books that were largely used.

As early as the year 1867 rumours became current that imputed to Dr. Sangster improper and unbecoming behaviour to young ladies under his charge. These grew more general and persistent, until they reached the ears of the Council, which, however, paid little regard to them. At length his conduct towards a particular young lady attracted such universal attention and remark, that he found it necessary to resign his position in 1871. His pamphlet and letters will supply us with abundant materials for whatever else we may find necessary to say about him.

DR. SANGSTER AS OUR "FELLOW-TEACHER."

If Dr. Sangster is our fellow-teacher, then, by law, he is ineligible to represent us, and if he is not our fellow-teacher he merely uses the term to catch a few stray votes. It may be said he was our fellow-teacher in times past; but let us see to what extent he was. A good many of the changes that have been accomplished for the benefit of the profession and the advancement of education originated in the discussions, and from the efforts of the Ontario Teachers' Association. Its meetings have been held, with one exception, in Toronto, where he lived and taught, and have been attended by various gentlemen who, though not "fellow-teachers," took a deep interest in education; but for the past ten years Dr. Sangster has never lent a helping hand to push on the work in which we have been engaged; he has never given those meetings the sanction even of his presence. Had he given his aid when, from his position as master in the Normal School, it would have been valuable, the benefits we are now enjoying, and in which he wishes to participate in a manner that reminds us of the story of the jackal and the lion,

SMITH.

h, 1874.

nized to pro-
necessarry to

sanction, if
s said, objec-

would have been sooner obtained, and others, that we have still to battle for, would have been nearer realization. At the first meeting of this Association, held in the Toronto Court-house, Dr. Sangster was present, and was asked, and even urged, to accept a position on the directorate, but he steadily refused, his reason possibly being prompted by the same feeling that made Satan exclaim :

"Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven."

From what we have observed of Dr. Sangster's career, his principle seems to have been to engage in no undertaking that was not of pecuniary benefit to himself. All his efforts in connection with education have been made with a view to making money ; and are we to suppose, therefore, that he has been spending the past year perambulating the country, giving lectures on education, &c., from pure devotion to the profession ? He may tell that to the marines, but the teachers of Ontario, who know him, are not so gullible as to believe it. We are not enough in the secrets to give a detailed history of these peregrinations, but we can mention a few incidents which it would require but little imagination to make a very pretty story of.

(1.) Dr. Sangster had a meeting of inspectors, and others in his confidence, during our last year's Convention. (2.) At its last sitting certain inspectors tried to foist upon the meeting a resolution, intended to render nugatory one passed by the public school teachers on a previous day, having reference to teachers' institutes. The inspectors' resolution had particular reference to the appointment of some one person to conduct them. It was only by persistent watchfulness on our part that this resolution was prevented from getting the sanction of the Association. (3.) We next find Dr. Sangster holding these institutes throughout the country, under the auspices of some of the inspectors. (4.) The crowning event is his coming out as a candidate for the Council of Public Instruction. As a subsidiary fact, we may mention that during the past year remarkable changes have taken place in the breasts of some inspectors towards him, one of the most remarkable being the case of an inspector who, twelve months ago, was not on speaking terms with the doctor, and for good reasons too, but is now hand in glove with him. We have heard some explanations of these changes, and of the benefits the doctor himself hopes to derive from his own efforts as an educational missionary ; though they are not of a romantic nature, they may help to gild the story, and we shall give them. One man, who is a dab at mathematics, is to get a situation to suit his tastes in the new Normal School ; another is to have the office of English master bestowed upon him, and — ; but we will not harrow the doctor's feelings further by the melancholy spectacle of some of his "fellow-teachers" retailing such stories against a man of such immaculate principles, and of such a lofty mind. We will rather bend our heads in shame. . . . But we cannot refrain from lifting them again to say, that insinuations have actually been thrown out, and even statements made, that he, who has exerted himself on our behalf in such a disinterested manner during the past year, intends to have the principalship of one of the new Normal Schools, or, or—oh, tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon—intends to step into the Chief Superintendent's shoes. How can any one be so wicked as to suspect him of rewarding himself by looking that way ? Granted that he is an intensely selfish man, as his pamphlet shows him to be, even to the extent of sacrificing the happiness of his children to gratify his own wishes, has he not been travelling the length and breadth of the land giving lectures on our behalf without money and without price ? Has he not denied, too, in his pamphlet, that he promised any such bribes, though Shakespeare whispers a mischievous reply, that, with a little alteration, we cannot refrain from giving :

"Have you not heard it said full oft,—
The doctor's nay does stand for nought."

Why should we regard him, as Dickens describes Mrs. Todgers, with one eye beaming with affection on his friends, and calculation shining out of the other ? Fellow-teachers, the only answer we can give is, that we are wilful enough not to be led by the nose as asses are, and that we view things as they appear to us, not as he represents them.

THE LEGAL ASPECT OF DR. SANGSTER'S CASE.

Dr. Sangster at first declared his purpose of getting an English divorce from his wife—even to the extent of spending his last shilling in so doing ; but we are led to infer from his pamphlet, the native hue of this virtuous resolution was sicklied over with the thought of the money it would cost, and he adopted the cheaper and far speedier method of procuring a divorce in the States.

On page eleven of the pamphlet, in Mr. Carter's legal opinion, the following words, put in capitals, occur :—"I would say that a second marriage, after divorce obtained in a foreign tribunal, either in England, Canada, or the United States, could not be held invalid and felonious without assuming that the divorce was void even in the foreign jurisdiction in which it was pronounced." On page sixteen occur the words :

"In Dr. Sangster's case we could not hold the second marriage invalid and felonious in "Canada without assuming that the American divorce was void even in the United States."

If the divorce is illegal, therefore, the second marriage is also illegal.

The
Canada.
discreti
precedin
stateme
"that v
"requir
His

shall spe
his wifo

Now
that th
the com
in the S
as, by la
vious to
of resid
during t
were the
we are y
Dr. San
importa
in all se
tained b
Carter's
"the di

Fell
becomes
a man w
tion by t
lect. We
determin
moting t
own mo
young la
improper
towards
had such
would ha
how liab
his relati
acted wit
Toronto

Had
obtained
then hav
the peace
parents v
opposed
two, and

Let u
marriage

"Of

it was sol

"We

"Be

nent lawy

of the Su

that ther

cently su

Cameron,

validity o

here in Ca

"Accor

The divorce was obtained in Illinois, in July, 1870, while Dr. Sangster had his residence in Canada. By the law of Illinois a divorce may be granted for any cause which the court in its discretion may deem fit, but the complainant must have resided in the State for one year last preceding the filing of the petition. Dr. Sangster tacitly acknowledges the correctness of this statement of the law of Illinois in his letter to the *Mail* of July 14, by saying—"The fact is "that where the offences complained of have arisen within the state, no such year's residence is "required."

His lamentable want of straightforwardness in dealing with this unfortunate divorce we shall speak of elsewhere, and we shall view it as it has turned out to be, a divorce obtained by his wife.

Now the Illinois law demands that the complainant must reside a year within the State, or that the offence must be committed within the State before a divorce can be issued. But the complainant in this case, to wit, Mrs. Sangster, has never been proved to have lived a year in the State of Illinois before her divorce, and even if she had, the divorce would not be valid, as, by law, her place of residence is wherever her husband's is, and Dr. Sangster, for the year previous to July, 1870, was constant in the performance of his duties at the Normal School, his place of residence was Yorkville, and he has given no evidence that he was even once out of the city during that period. If the offences complained of were committed within the State, by whom were they committed? certainly not by Dr. Sangster nor his wife, for neither of them, so far as we are yet informed, had been there to commit the offences previous to the issue of the divorce. Dr. Sangster complains in his pamphlet of the difficulty of proving a negative, but here is a very important positive that he has never attempted to prove. From all that has been stated, we are, in all sadness, reduced most unwillingly to the inexorable conclusions, that the divorce was obtained by improper means, that it is of no legal value whatever, and that, therefore, to use Mr. Carter's own words, "the second marriage is invalid and felonious, as it has been shown that "the divorce is void even in the foreign jurisdiction where it was pronounced."

Fellow-teachers, the question as to whether Dr. Sangster should be our representative or not, becomes insignificant, when we consider the lamentable position in which he has placed himself; a man who stood at the head of our profession in the country, and who had attained to that position by the most praiseworthy exercise of energy, industry, and a fairly vigorous and acute intellect. Would it not have been ten thousand times better had he sacrificed his own inclinations, and determined to devote the remainder of his life to the noble work of training his children and promoting their happiness—duties the more incumbent on him, seeing, as he represents, that their own mother had left them? He pleads as his excuse for the course of action he took, that the young lady's character would have suffered had he not married her. Why did he ever by such improper conduct as he was guilty of, allow it to suffer? Why did he, a man of mature age, act towards that young lady of twenty as an accepted lover even before his wife left him, if he had such regard for her character as he now professes to have had? Of course her character would have suffered—to his shame be it said. But does it not suffer much more now? We know how liable the tongue of scandal is to wag, and that the slightest familiarity, inconsistent with his relation as Head Master towards her, would give occasion for invidious remark. Had he acted with a deportment becoming his position, the rumours that at last rendered the air of Toronto murky, would never have spread.

Had he, setting aside the fact that his first and most imperative duty was to his children, obtained an English divorce, the result would have been far less disastrous; for he would then have been a legally married man, and he would have had the satisfaction of knowing that the peace and union of a whole family, now shattered, would have been preserved; for both her parents would have become reconciled to a legal English divorce, though they were strongly opposed to the match at all, as unseemly between a middle-aged man and a girl of twenty-two, and as objectionable on other obvious grounds.

"WAYS THAT ARE DARK, AND TRICKS THAT ARE VAIN."

Let us now examine Dr. Sangster's pamphlet to find what he says of his divorce and second marriage:—

"Of the legality of this second marriage according to the laws of the United States, where it was solemnized, there can be no question whatever."—p. 7.

"We have seen that *Dr. Sangster's* divorce was legal in the United States."—p. 7.

"Before I married my second wife in Michigan, I obtained an opinion from the most eminent lawyer in Detroit, to the effect that my divorce though issued in Illinois, was by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States absolutely valid in every State in the Union, and that therefore my marriage in Detroit would be a perfectly legal and binding act. I have recently submitted this divorce, and the whole series of documents to the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, asking him for a short non-technical opinion which teachers could understand, of the validity of my divorce, and the legality of my second marriage, both in the United States and here in Canada; the following is Mr. Cameron's opinion:—

"IN RE SANGSTER.

"According to the law, in the State of Illinois, and the principles generally acted on in the

Courts of the United States, the marriage which took place in Upper Canada in December, 1851, was dissolved by the sentence of divorce pronounced in July, 1870, and the subsequent marriage of Dr. Sangster in the State of Michigan, was therefore a valid marriage, and undoubtedly recognizable in the United States. And the decree of divorce of July, 1870, being regular according to the law of Illinois, and the second marriage being valid in the United States, it is also valid in Canada.

"(Signed),

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON.

"Romain Buildings,
15th June, 1874."

"I can readily understand how a man might be willing to save them (his children) from her (his wife's) polluting presence by a separation, obtained on grounds even less strong than adultery."—p. 14.

"We have seen that she (Mrs. Sangster) has been divorced, *a vinculo matrimonii*,"—p. 15.

"Circumstances, into which I do not wish to enter, unless forced to do so, came to my knowledge, which led me to see that the existing state of things *could not be permitted* to continue, and we were, in pursuance of steps then taken, divorced by legal process in the State of Illinois."—p. 19.

"That I did subsequently marry on my divorce, &c."—p. 21.

"I some days ago sent my divorce to the United States, in order to obtain a certificate from the Secretary of State as to its genuineness and validity, and also opinions from the most eminent legal men of the country, of the perfect legality of both my divorce and marriage."—p. 32 note.

The whole tenor of these extracts gives the indubitable impression that Dr. Sangster obtained the divorce, and we have not yet met a person who would put any other construction upon them.

Now mark what follows. In consequence of discussions in the public press, Mr. Hillyard Cameron wrote the following letter to the *Globe* :—

(To the Editor of the *Globe*.)

"SIR,—On my return to Toronto to-day, my attention has been called to an article in the *Globe* of the 8th inst. on Dr. Sangster, and to an opinion set out therein, and alleged to be mine, on the validity of a divorce from his first wife, obtained by him in the State of Illinois.

"My opinion was never either asked or given on such a case, but it was asked for and given on a decree of divorce obtained on the petition of his first wife, against Dr. Sangster, on a statement of facts submitted therewith, and as only part of it is set out in the *Globe's* article, it does not show my views on the case really sent to me, and bears no application whatever, as stated, to a divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster.

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON.

"Romain Buildings, 10th July, 1874."

It will be observed that, Mr. Cameron denies ever having been asked to give an opinion on a divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster. What then becomes of Dr. Sangster's own statements, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a mere coincidence, or does it imply collusion on their part to deceive teachers and the public? Dr. Sangster, in a very lame letter, addressed to the *Mail* of July 14th, says: "I have no where in my pamphlet, either said or implied that the divorce of July, 1870, was sought for by me, or that I ever sought for a divorce in the State of Illinois at all." We shall not insult the intelligence of our fellow-teachers by discussing this assertion, we feel quite safe in leaving the question of its veracity to all who have read the above extracts, or have read his pamphlet.

It will be further observed, that Mr. Cameron says his opinion was asked for and given on a decree of divorce obtained on the PETITION OF HIS FIRST WIFE AGAINST DR. SANGSTER, on a statement of facts submitted therewith. Now, throughout the pamphlet Dr. Sangster represents himself as a grievously wronged husband, as one who was altogether the innocent victim of the gross wickedness of an abandoned wife. Not one word does he use to imply that he committed any indiscretion, much less any fault. Yet now we find that his wife petitioned against him for a divorce, got it, and it is upon that divorce that she married again, and that he subsequently acted. The question that now arises is, upon what ground did she obtain a divorce? On page 20 of his pamphlet, he says: "In England, with twenty millions of people, some three hundred (divorces) are granted every year, yet only on the ground of adultery, upon which ground alone I think divorces ought to issue." Was it, then, in accordance with this opinion, on the ground of his adultery she obtained her divorce? Not so, for in his letter to the *Mail* of the 14th inst., he avers that the charge of adultery was never referred against him by any one but the editor of the *Globe*. We conclude, therefore, that despite his opinion, he acted upon a divorce granted for some other cause than adultery. What was that other cause? It cannot have been cruelty, for he represents himself as a most forbearing and exemplary husband. It cannot have been desertion, for if we accept his statement, the desertion was on his wife's part, (see pp. 15 and

19 of pamphlet). He cannot be accused of desertion, for we are told on page 7 that she lived, previous to her second marriage, in the enjoyment of a competency generously secured to her by a divorced and deeply wronged husband. We had hoped that the Dr. would not allow us to grope so long in the dark in this manner, but would promptly explain matters notwithstanding the awkward position that Mr. Cameron's letter placed him in; his letter in the *Mail* of the 14th inst. does not help us in the least, on the contrary, it merely throws dust in our eyes. In one part of it he says: "My friends all knew from the outset, that I intended to go, in the first place, on the divorce obtained by my former wife." But why did he not make all his "fellow teachers" his friends, and take them into his confidence? Why should any be slighted? For our own part, we would rather not be included amongst the number of his present "friends" to be made partners to the equivocation both he and "Hastings" practised in this matter.

Let us now discuss Mr. Cameron's final statement, "as only part of it (the opinion,) is set out in the *Globe's* article, it does not show my views on the case really sent to me." The part of it referred to is that already quoted and found on page 12 of the pamphlet. Then does Mr. Cameron mean to insinuate that his opinion was tampered with, to suit the purpose of Dr. Sangster? We can place no other construction upon his words, and his client's explanation in the letter so often referred to shows that we are right. "I asked," he says, "for a short, non-technical opinion which teachers could not misunderstand. When I received the opinion from Mr. Cameron's office, I found it longer and more abstruse than I thought desirable, and I vainly endeavoured to see Mr. Cameron to have it condensed. On my third call to see him, I was told he would not return to town for some days, and as my pamphlet had been delayed longer than I wished, I ventured to leave out what I regarded as mere extraneous matter, and to give in his own words what I and my friends (his friends again in his confidence) regarded as the substance of Mr. Cameron's opinion."

Dr. Sangster reminds us vividly of a fly caught on one of those fly-papers so useful now, it struggles hard to get free, but in the effort to get one leg free, another leg and a wing become entangled. If, instead of giving this explanation, he had published the original document, he would have shown a disposition to deal fairly with those he wishes to represent. He did not hesitate to regale us with a long and not very lucid legal opinion of Mr. Carter's, but when it is the opinion of one who is almost venerated throughout the land as a lawyer, and an upright man, it must needs be garbled to suit our dull intellects. We may be sure that Mr. Cameron would not put in one unnecessary word to cloud the clearness of his statement, and we have no doubt it was as non-technical as he could make it. Perhaps Mr. Cameron's next statement throws some light upon his client's suspicious proceeding. He says, the opinion he did insert "does not show my views on the case really sent to me." Then Mr. Cameron's words are arranged to bear a meaning he never intended, so that his legal opinion is still in Dr. Sangster's possession, and we have had something put before us not his at all. We are vividly reminded of Lord Bacon's words:—"These winding and crooked courses are the goings of the serpent, which goeth basely upon the belly, and not upon the feet." And what shall be said of the "friends" who co-operate with him in this deception?

Fellow-teachers, is not Dr. Sangster's conduct in connection with this divorce, a sufficient justification for preparing this pamphlet for your perusal. We would have been recreant to our duty had we remained silent. It is needful that all enjoying the franchise should know of such strange proceedings on the part of one who is seeking our suffrages.

It is to be regretted that Dr. Sangster did not publish Mr. Cameron's opinion at first; it is to be regretted that he does not publish it now and in full, to save his name from the bitter aspersions that are cast upon it. After all, what is a seat in the Council of Public Instruction to the fair fame of him who aspires to it; it is but as dross to the refined metal. Even should Dr. Sangster's ambition be gratified, he needs not lay the flattering unction to his soul, that in entering the Council chamber, he will leave the burden of his misdeeds behind him: No! it will stick to him there, and hamper him in every step he takes. While we lament that a man who held such an honourable name and position among us, should have done so much to merit reprobation, we must not yield to any mistaken pity, for we owe it as a duty to ourselves to preserve our good name from the imputations that would be cast upon it if we elected him to be our representative. He claims to be a fit person, which no one denies, but we do deny that he is a proper person.

DR. SANGSTER AND MRS. McCausland.

On page 24 of his pamphlet, Dr. Sangster says, that the step-mother of his present wife was among the first to receive, and the most untiring to circulate all that she heard to her step-daughter's detriment, and that she spread stories under the specious guise of anxiety for her welfare, which were received with bland and unquestioning faith. Most people never dreamt that those slanders were but the outpouring of a step-mother's hatred and spite. And again, on page 26, he says his present wife was driven from her home by the ceaseless persecution of her step-mother. In a letter referred to on page 26, and characterized by Dr. Ryerson as the worst thing in the case, he says that this lady has a heart as black with venom, malignity, and revenge,

as ever God permitted to beat in a human breast. Again, on page 26, he speaks of her as a designing busy-body, who remained an old maid so long, that all the milk of human kindness was turned to vinegar, and then unhappily for his present wife, her brother, and sister, she became their step-mother.

We trust the lady teachers of the country will take particular note of these unmanly attacks on a very estimable lady.

In reply to them. Mrs. McCausland hands to the present Committee the following

VOLUNTARY STATEMENT.

I was head-mistress of Yorkville School during a period of eighteen years.

I have been over fifteen years in my present relation to my step-daughters, and when I assumed this responsibility, they were respectively about the ages of seven and nine years.

In 1861-2, Dr. Sangster was Trustee of Yorkville School, and while filling that office, always expressed the highest opinion of my professional abilities, as well as *sincere regard for me personally*; and that on several occasions, before a crowded audience in the Town Hall.

In July, 1868, he became an occasional visitor at our house; *the family, at such times, always being present*; and several of the visits referred to were of a professional character; and as the whole family, six in all, had been trained in the P. N. School—four of these under his own care, this did not appear extraordinary.

During a continued friendship of *two years*, he often remarked, "What a blessing those children possess in having such a mother"; and he himself told me that "my step-daughters always spoke of me even more affectionately than of their father." I have also heard him say that "*every one knew that I was the salvation of the family.*"

We had, at several times, received intimations of Dr. Sangster's attentions to the young lady under his charge, and amongst others, an anonymous note, to the same effect; which were all rejected by us, as idle gossip, or malicious slander; however, as similar reports still continued to circulate, it became my imperative duty to speak to him on the matter; when he declared, "he had never looked that way," and emphatically asked, "How could you think any such thing respecting me?"

He did not speak to me, nor did he call at my house for three months after. *Still believing in his integrity and innocence*, I wrote an apology; to which I received his reply couched in the most friendly terms, in which he asks "How could you imagine that I would be guilty of stealing the affections of any member of your family, while going out and into your house as a brother?" adding, "If an angel from heaven were to tell me that *such a suspicion originated with you*, I would not believe it, for I consider you the *very type of a Christian friendly woman.*"

The letter, from which these extracts are taken, was written *some months after his proposal of marriage* to my step-daughter, and is dated May, 1870.

From the time that the foregoing and all the letters, subsequently written on the subject, were placed in the hands of the Chief Superintendent of Education (which we considered our final action in the matter), it was understood to be my *husband's order* and wish, that Dr. Sangster's name should not be mentioned in our house, and my step-daughter having transgressed this command of her father, I requested her to refrain from so doing, and in consequence of what was then said, she and I did not again hold any communication with each other.

This unhappy state continued for two months, and I then informed my husband that, she must either take board in the city, or I should be obliged to take mine elsewhere, until she should leave. This she overheard, and next day, on 4th of March, 1871, removed to Toronto to board with another young lady. She was then in her 22nd year, and had a salary of \$500 as teacher in the Model School.

I have been accused by Dr. Sangster, of driving the family from their home, but so far from this being the case, our domestic peace *had never been broken*, nor had there been any more kind, dutiful and obedient daughters, until circumstances, *such as those above alluded to*, in connection with Dr. Sangster, transpired.

ANNE J. McCAUSLAND.

Yorkville, July 22nd, 1874.

THE COUNCIL OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

Till within a few months past, the Council was an anomalous body. Its members were appointed by the Crown, were irresponsible to the people, had the power of making regulations which, within its jurisdiction, had all the force of laws, and of giving interpretation to statutes which had all the authority of judicial decisions. Its proceedings were secret, so that it was not known how members attended to their duties, but an impression has long prevailed that too often as Louis XIV. boasted that he was the State, the Chief Superintendent could say that he was the Council.

The existence of such a body was contrary to the genius of our institutions, its legislation was often hurtful to educational interests, obstructive to the progress of our schools, and dictatorial to us as teachers. Many of its members knew no more about the business they had to

transact than a Hottentot knows about the coming transit of Venus. It needs cause no surprise that grievances should spring from a body so constituted. Regulations were issued for the government of schools, which it was impossible to carry out; programmes were framed so impracticable, that they had to be either cast aside or greatly modified, the schools were deluged with text-books, many of which were entirely unfitted for the work they were intended to assist us in doing. The Council, in fact, showed a masterly knowledge of "how not to do it." But it was remiss in other important matters. One of its most solemn duties is to insist that the strictest morality shall pervade every part of our school system. The public who have vital interest in this matter, have a right to expect from the highest to the lowest of those employed in training the youth of the country, the utmost rectitude of conduct. It is to be regretted that the Council during a few past years should have been so lax in this respect, and should have allowed the success of the Normal School to throw into the shade the misdeeds of its Head Master. The rumours of Dr. Sangster's improper behaviour towards ladies under his training, were so prevalent that they cannot but have reached the ears of other members than the Chief Superintendent. It may be said they were mere rumours, but when they were given credence to not by teachers alone, but by respectable persons of other classes of the community, it was a significant indication that something was wrong—where there is much smoke there is sure to be a little fire. In one particular case, we know, that documentary evidence of such improper behaviour was given to the Chief Superintendent; but the only notice that seems to have been taken of it was, the administration of a rebuke from this not very effective quarter, and in this perfunctory manner they tried to cleanse our most important Public School Institution, from moral excrecence that was spreading over it like a fungus. Notwithstanding the rebuke and promise of amendment that it brought forth, Dr. Sangster went on as was his wont, and we suppose would have been allowed to do so till this day, had he not—to his credit and to the shame of the Council be it spoken—paid sufficient regard to public opinion to resign.

Fellow-teachers, happily the days of an irresponsible Council of Public Instruction are ended. Owing to our appeals, through the Ontario Teachers' Association, to public opinion, and to the Parliament, our Legislature in its wisdom has granted us the right to have a representative of our own in that Council, and it remains for us to show the public and the Legislature that we can thoroughly appreciate it, by sending a proper man to represent us. We have now the opportunity of showing to the country that whatever has been wrong about the head of our Public School system, the heart is all right. By sending Mr. Smith to represent us, our action will be a protest, we trust a final one, against the slightest laxity being allowed to prevail in the deliberations of that body, or amongst its executive officers.

MISREPRESENTATION OF THE OPINIONS OF PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH.

Professor Goldwin Smith has been accused of Atheism. We might be content with replying that the most eloquent of living English Divines, Rev. Canon Liddon, has quoted Mr. Smith's writings with approbation in his sermons; but we will use Mr. Smith's own words, from his "Lectures on the Study of History," to upset this absurd charge. We quote from the edition of 1873, published by Adam, Stevenson & Co.

"All the discoveries of science confirm the hypothesis that the world was made by one God; an hypothesis which, it should be observed, was quite independent of the progress of science, since it had been promulgated, in the first chapter of Genesis, before science came into existence." Page 83.

"In learning more of man, we learn more of Him in whose image man was made; in learning more of the creation, we learn more of the Creator; and everything which in the course of civilization tends to elevate, deepen, and refine the character generally, tends to elevate, deepen, and refine it in its religious aspect." Page 83.

"Christianity rests on one fundamental moral principle, as the complete basis of a perfect moral character, the principle being love of our neighbour. And the type of character set forth in the Gospel History is an absolute embodiment of Love, both in the way of action and affection, crowned by the highest possible exhibition of it in an act of the most transcendent self-devotion to the interests of the human race. This being the case, it is difficult to see how the Christian morality can be brought into antagonism with the moral progress of mankind; or how the Christian type of character can ever be left behind by the course of human development, can lose the allegiance of the moral world, or give place to a newly emerging and higher ideal. This type, it would appear, being perfect, will be final." Page 129.

"The type (of character) set up in the Gospels seems to stand out in unapproached purity, as well as in unapproached perfection of moral excellence." Page 130.

"The life depicted in the Gospel is one of pure beneficence adapted to all." Page 132.

"Mr. Newman has attempted to deny not only that the Christian type of character is perfect, but that it is unique. What character then in history is its equal?" Page 140.

These are extracts made almost at random, and they not only show the absurdity of the charge, but exhibit in a clear light an elevated Christian and moral cast of mind. If they were to serve no other purpose than to direct attention to the book, we shall be glad we have made them, for it is a volume that will well repay perusal.

Professor Smith has also been accused of entertaining Malthusian doctrines in his lectures. Now, we have the authority of Mr. Smith for saying he does not believe in any such doctrines, it is therefore impossible that he should approve of them; if they are referred to at all it can only be incidentally, as he would refer to any other historical fact.

MINOR MATTERS.

Dr. Sangster's friends re-echo his cry, and say we desire to crush him. This is a new subterfuge to direct attention from the real issue, and bears absurdity on the face of it. Our attention has been engaged too much on the principles involved in this contest to think of the man himself apart from these. It is not Dr. Sangster we want to crush, but we want to stamp out the depraved moral tone that he fostered by his example, and that he wants us to express our approval of, by electing him, however disastrous it must be to our own characters. Had he been content with the enjoyments of his home, we would have been the last to mar the sanctity of the domestic hearth by any word of reprobation or animadversion; but when he tries to foist himself upon us as he has tried to do during the past year, it behoves us to speak out against him with no uncertain sound.

We are twitted with the fact that he is still allowed to retain his certificate as Public School teacher, which we do not try to deprive him of. Our reply to this is, that he has not yet attempted to teach upon that certificate, that it is the duty of the Council to attend to such a matter as that, and this body is, until the elections are over, in a moribund condition.

A number of gentlemen, at the late meeting of Delegates, declared that they had not yet seen or heard anything that could convince them that Dr. Sangster was anything but a moral man. We fear the "trail of the serpent is over them all." Their notion of morality must be a strange one, and it would be interesting to have a definition of it. Let us take that phase of the subject that includes duty to one's neighbour, and see how grievously their "fellow-teacher," has failed. Was he doing as he would be done by, when he associated with a young lady to such an extent as to excite his wife's jealousy, would he like a child of his to be so dealt with by a married man? Was he doing his duty towards his neighbour, when he garbled Mr. Cameron's opinion to deceive us, or when he secured an American divorce, or when he abused in the most rancorous manner two defenceless ladies, or when he stated in his pamphlet that he had not spoken to inspectors or teachers of his private wrongs for the last two years, a statement notoriously untrue, as many throughout the country can testify.

CONCLUSION.

Fellow-teachers of the Public and Separate Schools of Ontario, we have thus endeavoured to place the merits of the two candidates plainly before you, in order that you may exercise your franchise intelligently, and with a view to the best interests of the important work in which we are all engaged. We are now for the first time privileged with a recognized *status* in the land, and we owe it not only to ourselves but to that noble system of popular education, which is so firmly rooted in the affections of our people to exercise that privilege wisely and well. It is our bounden duty so to vote at the coming election, that our choice of a representative may strengthen, rather than impair, that high estimate of our profession which has in no small degree prompted the Legislature to concede to us the right of having a voice at the Council Board.

We are now on our trial, the lady-teachers especially. Shall it at length be discovered that we do not as a class possess deep reverence and jealousy for all that is pure and upright, and honourable? On the contrary, let us prove that our hearts beat in unison with the heart of Ontario in loyalty to the divine and ennobling principles of Christian morality, and that we will not tolerate a systematic violation of that code which is at once the glory and the happiness of our land.

Fellow-teachers, if you give your votes purely on the merits of the candidates, and do not allow yourselves to be influenced by personal considerations, we feel satisfied that Professor Goldwin Smith will be your choice. In him you have a man who has been actuated by great singleness of purpose and a high sense of duty in every public position he has yet occupied; a man who, during the short time he has been amongst us, has shown more interest in us and in our work, by his lecture at one of our annual conventions, and by his address at another, than the other candidate displayed during the whole of his Normal School career; a man who has been deemed worthy of occupying the position of President of our Central Association, which is composed of

High-School teachers, Inspector and Public School teachers. Especially we desire to impress upon you that he is a man free from any trammels that would clog his action as our representative; a man of commanding intellect, of great force of character, and, above all, of spotless name.

Fellow-teachers, we have a golden opportunity of enhancing the respect due to our profession by casting our votes, so as to show our appreciation of the best features of human character, and our contempt for those that are mean, despicable, and immoral.

Let us act then as men and women should act, whose task it is to direct the morals and form the characters of the youth of this Province. Let us vindicate the dignity of womanhood, woefully degraded by the opposing candidate. Let us affirm our determined adherence to those principles that are the only sure guarantees of abiding felicity around our hearths and in our homes, and in fine, let us sustain our own professional name and fame, and the cause of moral purity in education, by voting in favour of Professor Goldwin Smith.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

It has caused some surprise, that in a matter on which public sentiment is almost unanimous, there should be any difference of opinion amongst teachers. We will not try to account for the fact, but be content to give a few extracts from journals of various sects, and of all shades of politics bearing upon the questions discussed in the previous pages, as an evidence of its existence.

In addition to these, we might make quotations of similar import, from such papers as the following: *Listowell Banner*, *Mount Forest Confederate*, *Chatham Banner*, *Drayton Enterprise*, *Huron Signal*, *Owen Sound Times*, *Dundas County Herald*, *Paris Transcript*, *Embro Review*, *Lucknow Sentinel*, *Colborne Express*, *Daily Ontario*, &c., did space permit. Enough are made, however, to show the drift of public opinion.

(*The Ingersoll Chronicle.*)

The teachers of Ontario will honour their high profession by the election of Goldwin Smith. In the Council of Public Instruction, he will "speak as one having authority." No other man at the new Board, with the exception of Rev. Dr. Ryerson, will be able to show that he has had the same opportunities for becoming acquainted with the educational wants of the present age. Further, it may be safely said, that no man to be called to the new Board will be able to prove that he has excelled Goldwin Smith in those gifts which render their possessor useful and eminent. As an expounder of statesmanship, who has shrunk from coming to the front of noisy platforms, Goldwin Smith has made his mark in the political page of Canadian history; and has influenced for good the current of political thought in the Mother Country. As a master of style and of the English language, he has no equal on the American continent. We speak within the mark in all we have said, in the way of commendation, concerning Goldwin Smith. We are convinced that the teachers of Ontario, after they shall have elected him as their spokesman and representative, will never regret their choice. Upon no better man, as far as our knowledge of all possible candidates extends, could that choice fall. For, in the fullest sense of the word Professor Goldwin Smith is a gentleman. That he is a scholar is known to all men. That he is a man of unblemished reputation, is an additional reason why the teachers of Ontario will elect as the representative Teacher, and their own particular standard bearer in the Council of Public Instruction.

(*Sarnia Observer.*)

In short, the whole affair, so far as Dr. Sangster is concerned, is one of the most scandalous transactions we ever heard of; and if its perpetrator was to succeed in securing a seat in the Council of Public Instruction for Ontario, after his disgraceful conduct has been so thoroughly exposed, it would indicate such a low state of morality on the part of the elective body, as might well cause all classes in the community to hang their heads in the deepest humiliation. We are glad to see, by our exchanges from various parts of the Province, that there is little likelihood of this result. In a number of instances, Dr. Sangster's candidature is repudiated unanimously by the teachers, while in no case which has come under our observation, has he received more than one-third of the votes polled.

(*Brockville Recorder.*)

The man who can sustain Dr. Sangster in his present position, in our estimation, is not to be trusted in a moral point of view, and ought not to be engaged in teaching morality to the youth of the country. We shall be curious to know the names of the female teachers who support Dr. Sangster. We advise teachers to consider well the subject of voting for a representative to the Board of Education. Let them remember they are educators of youth, and immorality ought to be frowned upon by them.

(Brantford *Expositor*.)

Apart from this, is there any comparison between this *protege* of the Education Office and Goldwin Smith? The latter, it is true, was never a Public School Teacher in Canada, but he is well known on both sides of the Atlantic as one of the best thinkers and ripest scholars of the age. He was professor of history in the University of Oxford, and is intimately versed in all the public questions of the day. Thoroughly conversant with the school systems of England and the continent, and of America too, his advanced ideas and powerful intellect would make him a most useful and honourable member of the Council of Instruction, and a great accession to the cause of education in Canada. He was elected to the Presidency of the Teachers' Provincial Association last year, and has manifested a deep interest in educational matters since he settled in Canada. He would act fearlessly and conscientiously for what he considers the best interest of those he represented, and would never be found swerving from the path of rectitude and honour for selfish ends, or official ambition. If he is rejected by the teachers of Ontario, no one supposes for a moment that Goldwin Smith will be the loser. It is the Council who will lose the benefit of his vast experience, careful observation, and ripe scholarship.

(The London Free Press.)

We are not sorry, that the people of Canada should set their face against everything, against every circumstance however trivial in itself, that would tend to familiarize the public mind with the frequency of divorce, with those subjects that render divorce necessary, and with the facilities that the Illinois laws and Chicago lawyers hold out to such as desire to get quit of their life partners. This feeling lies at the root of all the opposition Dr. Sangster has met with in his canvass. There is as yet nothing before the public that would justify this gentleman in the course he has pursued. There is on the contrary, much that requires explanation before that class, in whose hands are the moral and intellectual training of the next generation of Canadians, would be justified in the eyes of the parents of their pupils, in selecting the gentleman as their representative on the Council of Public Instruction for Ontario.

(British American Presbyterian.)

It is well known that if the teachers of Ontario choose Dr. Sangster to represent them at the Council Board, then they will prove to a demonstration that the Legislature made a sad mistake when they entrusted to them the franchise for any such purpose.

The more this painful matter is stirred, and the more the conduct of a very considerable number of the teachers of the Province in reference to it is marked, the more it is seen that it is not simply Dr. Sangster that is on his trial. The whole of our public school teachers are being tested. It is a matter of the most important description that our teachers should be persons in whose character and honour, the community have perfect confidence. They are put in charge of girls at a time of life when they are very susceptible of impression, and in circumstances which give the teachers very great influence over them for either good or evil. We know of nothing more calculated to shake the confidence of the community in the honour and integrity of our teachers than the way they are working and arguing for a man who has broken both the laws of God and the law of the land. The mere question of whether Dr. Sangster is to be elected or not is becoming comparatively insignificant when put side by side with one which now presses for an answer. "Can we trust our daughters to the care of men who, through their organs of the press and by their spoken speeches, profess such loose principles of morality and seem to fancy school girls fair game if the teacher happens to be inclined that way?" The excuses, palliations, and defences of Dr. Sangster's conduct are in short more painful than that conduct itself, and will force trustees in future to ask candidates for their schools how far they reckon themselves justified in taking liberties with their female pupils without expecting to be called to account?

The Montreal Witness.

It is a great pity that there should be any necessity to touch this disgraceful case again, but the shamelessness of Dr. Sangster, and the moral obliquity of his friends amongst the teachers, render such a course imperatively necessary. It was a most disgraceful thing, in the first place, for him, a married man of mature age, to use his position as a teacher to gain the affections of one of his pupils, a young girl of 16 or 17 years, and it was still worse for him to inveigle her into marriage, the legality of which at best is very doubtful, and which there are good grounds to believe is absolutely null; but the worst thing of all is for him now to set himself up as a fit representative of the Ontario teachers at the Board of Public Instruction, pretending that all he has done is right, and striving to inculcate loose notions of the marriage tie which are abhorrent to every right-thinking person. On whatever grounds the divorce was granted, it cannot hold good in Canada, for the parties were married in Canada. They never resided in Illinois, and consequently had no right to get a divorce there. Any other law would be simply ridiculous, for if a divorce obtained in Illinois, or any other State, was allowed to hold good in Canada on the ground that it was legal there, and consequently must be here, our whole legislative and most scandalous divorce laws of any foreign country, a position which we fancy is desired by very few Canadians. But it is asserted that the divorce is not good even in Illinois, as Dr. Sangster has never been a resident of that State, and consequently could only procure a divorce at Chicago by fraud, as the law requires a *bona fide* residence of one year within the State. There have been numerous verdicts in the United States Courts, that divorces procured by fraudulent misrepresentations are null, and this divorce would, therefore, not be legal, even in that land of easy morality as regards marriage laws.

Christian Guardian.

We confess, after reading most of what has appeared in the daily papers, and Dr. Sangster's able and plausible pamphlet, we see no ground to think that the allegations of the *Globe* are not amply sustained by the facts. We have shrunk from discussing so indelicate a question in a family paper, and would not refer to it at all, were it not that our silence might be misconstrued as condoning the course of Dr. Sangster. We do not wish to discuss the facts of the case here. But assuredly it cannot be denied, even by the most ardent friends of Dr. Sangster, that if such a course as that pursued by him was common in Canada, it would indicate a condition of public morality, and a looseness of views on the important question of marriage, that would be most discreditable to us as a people.

Canada Baptist.

We very much regret that a portion of the secular press favours the candidature of Dr. Sangster, whom we believe to be, as the leading paper of this Province has clearly demonstrated, morally disqualified for filling the office to which he aspires. * * * Apart from his past conduct, which has given rise to so grave a scandal, his disingenuous efforts to clear himself of the charges brought against him only sink him deeper in the mire, and afford additional evidence of his moral unfitness for the office which he seeks to fill.

Guelp Mercury.

In bringing his case before the public Dr. Sangster thought to justify his conduct by parading Mr. Cameron's opinion, which that gentleman now disowns. His case was bad before, but now he is utterly left without a defence, and moreover, stands convicted before the world of having deliberately and studiously sought to gain public confidence by fraud and falsehood. What will his defenders and apologists now say? What will the teachers who have been fooled and hoodwinked by him now say in his favour? If any of them are yet foolish enough and imprudent enough to support him, they will assuredly lose the respect of their constituents, and all who value truth, honour, and morality.

Owen Sound Advertiser.

That such a man, of such easy morality, or want of morality, should have the impudence to come forward as a candidate for such an office is astounding. That he should be supported by any one who claims to have the interests of schools under their charge is exceedingly painful, and that teachers should vote for him is worse still. That he is backed by persons high in educational authority, there seems to be no doubt from the circulation of his papers along with the *Journal of Education*, and the advocacy of his cause by inspectors in several parts of the country. This is entirely contrary to the spirit of the law.

Hamilton Times.

But whatever the true story be, one thing remains clear, that is, Dr. Sangster, in addition to his irregularities as a public official, has sought election to an important public situation by such dishonourable means, that even were the school teachers of Ontario to commit the folly and imprudence of electing him, honourable men would justly refuse to sit at the same Council Board with him.

Ottawa Times.

No parents who cared for the moral or religious welfare of their children would willingly submit their daughters to the temptations which a teacher inspired by such motives as actuated Dr. Sangster might subject them to. The very idea of the thing is revolting, and would be scouted with scorn and indignation. Yet this is the very offence which Dr. Sangster asks the public school teachers of Ontario to condone, sanction, and to justify. He lays down this issue to them in his pamphlet fairly and squarely, for he says, "I have not . . . done or said anything immoral or dishonourable." and adds, "I ask your votes, then." It may be that the votes will be given him, and that the public school teachers will assume, along with their would-be representatives, their share of his disgrace. At least, better things might be expected of them.

Prescott Telegraph.

No special pleading, and no casuistical asseverations of Mr. Hillyard Cameron, or any other needy lawyer given in black and white for the sake of a good round fee, will ever make black white, or change the ugly aspect of this revolting case, so as to justify Dr. Sangster in aiming at a position which, after all, is merely regarded by him as a stepping stone to the still higher position of Chief Superintendent of Education.

London Advertiser.

Points established by Mr. Cameron's denial are:—That Sangster himself was the culprit; that it was through his own misconduct the divorce was obtained; and that in order to obtain the sympathy of the public, and especially of the Ontario teachers, he wilfully perverted the facts, palmed off a distorted document as the "opinion" of Mr. J. H. Cameron, and sought to whiten his own reputation by blackening and defaming that of his wife. We think that even those who were most conspicuous in their championship of the double-wedded doctor will no longer put faith in his protestations of innocence, nor lend a helping hand to place one so disgraced in the responsible position of representative of the teachers of Ontario.

Kingston Whig.

As electors, the public school teachers of Ontario are on their trial, and they will ill return the confidence reposed in them if the first exercise of their franchise they chose as their representative at the Council Board, a man who is morally unclean, and whose adulterous wickedness demands the sharpest reprehension from the teachers of our youth. No honourable man-teacher can support Dr. Sangster's candidature, if he will consider the grave social questions hitherto involved, for let immorality triumph in this contest, and the bad exemplar will be fruitful of worse imitations. No woman-teacher claiming to be virtuous should lend her support to such licentious irregularity. Should such customs gain a footing among us, and she become a wife and a mother, she may live to regret the countenance she foolishly gave to violations of our marriage laws when she and her babes are deserted by a faithless husband who defends his concubinage by the winked-at practice of which the Sangster case furnishes a distinguished precedent.

Stratford Beacon.

The damaging fact remains that Dr. Sangster took advantage of the lax laws of our neighbours to do what the laws of his own country would not allow him, and now asks the public school teachers of Ontario to stamp his conduct with their approval. Will they do so? We think not. We cannot believe that the men who have the training of the youth of this country under their charge will be guilty of any such conduct. Many of them have attended the Normal School, and have no doubt heard Dr. Sangster's homilies on the rules of that institution, which are intended to prevent the male and female students from visiting each other or even speaking, while he, a married man, was deep in a flirtation himself. This alone is enough to disgust any man of average character and taste, even if there were no more serious charge. We cannot believe that the teachers of Ontario will stultify themselves by electing Dr. Sangster.

Barrie Gazette.

The acceptance by Mr. Goldwin Smith of the nomination of the Toronto Teachers' Association as a candidate for the Council of Public Instruction of Ontario makes the contest a square one between that gentleman and Dr. Sangster. Between the two, our public school teachers cannot surely hesitate long as to which of them is the most preferable for the position—and but for the fact that many of them committed doubt of the result of the election. Even now we trust, in spite of the wire-pulling of some of the School Inspectors, the majority of our teachers will refuse to indorse by their votes the scandalous private career of Dr. Sangster. If anything were needed to show the utterly defenceless nature of the position which the doctor tries to assume it is the fact that not a single paper of influence supports that gentleman.

Lindsay Post.

We have no hesitation in saying that it will be a scandal and a disgrace to an honourable profession charged with the responsible duty of training our children, and daily inculcating the highest examples of morality, if they elect a man who is a bigamist in the eye of the law; and whose conduct cannot be defended—a thing which is palliated by his advocates. Most of the school teachers will no doubt, look at this matter from a religious point of view. We should like to know if there is any denomination in Canada whose members are prepared, by word or deed, to sanction or pass over with indifference the one stain in Dr. Sangster's reputation. The Roman Catholic teachers will not, of course, give any indication of approval, as their Church is strongly opposed to divorce; and assuredly the most advanced Liberal in religious and social questions is not prepared to pave the way for the excesses that disfigure social relations across the border.

Peterborough Examiner.

Under the circumstances we cannot believe that teachers will stultify themselves by voting for the doctor. We cannot believe that they will exhibit such a disregard for character in a member of the Council as to vote to place a man there who is believed to have lax views of conjugal relations, and of whom in this respect we have no doubt. We would feel sorry if teachers so far forgot their own self-respect as to vote for a man whose moral character disqualifies him for the position he seeks to occupy.

Belleville Ontario.

When, without a single palliating circumstance—without even excusing himself or pleading the proclivities of youth and the weakness of our common humanity, Dr. Sangster asks the public school teachers of this country to elect him, it is due to themselves, the families with which they are identified as the instructors of youth, the law which they are bound to magnify, and morality, which they must never forget to elect him, he asks too much. No teacher who has these vital interests at heart can yield. Ignoring everything else, it could be no less than a calamity to cause marital rights to be more lightly regarded than formerly, and this must follow. No teacher who votes for Dr. Sangster unabsolved may escape the accusation of holding, to say the least, those views of marriage. Are teachers prepared to subject themselves to this criticism? If so, are parents willing to allow their daughters to come under the influence of such teachers? The issue, when carried to its ultimate conclusion, is a grave one.

Elora Observer.

Personal and domestic matters are duly respected here so long as morality is not openly defied, so long as publicity is not courted; but woe to that man who first does a shameful wrong and then seeks a public expression of opinion thereon. This Dr. Sangster has done, and in holding public meetings that he may demonstrate his educational qualifications for the position he aspires to, he has shown a want of delicacy, and offered public insult to the moral sensibilities of teachers and people, which alone unfits him for a seat at the Council Board.

The following Correspondence is important for the information of Teachers throughout the country:—

"TORONTO, July 27th, 1874.

"SIR,—As many of the Public School Teachers of Ontario are at present distant from the Post Offices to which their voting papers will be addressed, and may not return previous to the time fixed by the Legislature for the election of a representative, I beg respectfully to ask on their behalf,—If, from any cause, the printed form issued by the Education Department should not reach them, would their votes be valid if sent to the Chief Superintendent on plain paper, duly signed?

"I beg most respectfully to ask further, whether a list of the names of those voting for the respective candidates may be taken by any other person besides those appointed as scrutineers by the Department.

"Sir, your obedient servant,

"H. BROWNE.

"To the Hon. The Attorney-General,
"Ontario."

REPLY.

"TORONTO 27th July, 1874.

"SIR,—I have your letter of this date informing me that many of the Public School Teachers of Ontario are at present distant from the Post Offices to which their voting papers will be addressed, and may not return previous to the time fixed by the Legislature for the election of a representative, and asking on their behalf if, in case the printed papers issued by the Education Department should not reach these teachers, whether their votes would be valid if sent in to the Chief Superintendent on plain paper, duly signed. Assuming that the form given in the Act is adhered to, there is no necessity for using the printed forms, votes will be valid written "on plain paper duly signed."

"You enquire also whether a list of the names of those voting for the respective candidates may be taken by any other person besides those appointed as scrutineers by the Department. I see no objection to the names of the persons voting for the respective candidates being taken down by any person entitled to be present, besides the persons appointed scrutineers by the Department.

"Your obedient servant,

"O. MOWAT.

"Henry Browne, Esq.,
"City."

The following extracts from a circular issued by the Education Department are deserving of particular notice:—

"Teachers using the Voting Papers are entitled to seal the envelopes, they prepaying the ordinary three cents letter postage on them."

"The Voting Papers should be received by the Chief Superintendent sometime between the 11th and 18th of August, both days inclusive."

"As this rule may not have been in all cases observed, and with a view to enable Teachers to exercise their franchise according to law, a blank Voting Paper and envelope will be sent to every person whose name has been returned to the Education Department as entitled to vote under the Act."

"In putting up this Voting Paper, and sending it to the Chief Superintendent, every blank in the form should be filled up, and the name signed at the bottom of the paper on the line left for that purpose."

"It would be a great convenience if the name of the County, City, or Town of the voter were inserted in the blank for it, printed on the outside of the envelope."

Should teachers not receive their Voting Papers, it will be seen by the Attorney-General's letter, on the preceding page, that plain paper may be used to vote with, provided the following form be adhered to :—

TEACHERS' VOTING PAPER, 1874.

ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO THE COUNCIL OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION FOR ONTARIO.

I, _____
 a legally qualified _____ in the _____
(MASTER OR TEACHER) (PUBLIC OR SEPARATE)

School in _____ of _____
(SECTION, VILLAGE, ETC.)

resident at or near _____ in the County of _____
(POST OFFICE.)

do hereby declare—

1. That the signature affixed hereto is my proper handwriting.
2. That I vote for the following person as a Member of the Council of Public Instruction for Ontario—viz. : _____ in the County of _____
3. That I have signed no other voting paper at this election.
4. That this voting paper was executed by me on the day of the date hereof.

Witness my hand this _____ day of _____
 A.D., 1874.

(TEACHER AS ABOVE.)

The following is the form of address on the envelope :—

TEACHERS' VOTING PAPER.

_____ of _____
(COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN.)

To the

CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION,

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,

TORONTO.

 Be sure the postage is prepaid, as on ordinary letters, and the envelope sealed.

Mail your votes as soon after the 11th of August as possible ; remember if they reach the Education Department, Toronto, before the 11th or after the 18th August, they are lost.

If more pamphlets are needed, address the Secretary, Mr. Henry Browne, Box 40, Yorkville P.O.

Do not fail to use your influence with your fellow-teachers to get them to vote for Mr. Smith : remember what is at stake.